

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/619,828	07/15/2003	Yi-Ming Sheu	TSM03-0140	7191	
43859 75	590 11/16/2004		EXAM	INER	
SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.			FARAHAN	FARAHANI, DANA	
17950 PRESTO	ON ROAD, SUITE 1000				
DALLAS TX	75252		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			$\Lambda^n$			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Common	10/619,828	SHEU ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
<u> </u>	Dana Farahani	2814				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address:				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed  rs will be considered timely.  the mailing date of this communic  (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133).	cation.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 A	uaust 2004.					
	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		osecution as to the meri	ts is			
closed in accordance with the practice under l	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims	·					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application		•				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		i			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152	2.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	·		:			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea	s have been received. Is have been received in Applicati Inity documents have been receive	ion No	<b>;</b>			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	` ''	∍d. ·				
Attachment(s)		(070 440)				
1)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D					
<ul> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ul>	5) Notice of Informal F	Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/619,828 Page 2

Art Unit: 2814

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 1, 3, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Doyle et al., hereinafter Doyle (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0074598A1), previously cited.

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Doyle discloses in figure 17 a transistor device comprising a semiconductor region having a top surface, a source region 146 in the semiconductor region; a drain region 148 in the semiconductor region; a channel region in the semiconductor region between the source region and the drain region (not shown but inherent to the structure); an impurity region 142 within the channel region and spaced from the top surface, the impurity region laterally spaced from the source and drain regions, as can be seen in the figure; a gate 149 overlying the channel region; and a gate dielectric (not shown, but inherent to the gate 149) between the gate and the channel region.

Regarding claim 3, see paragraph 48, line 11.

Regarding claim 6, see paragraph 36.

Application/Control Number: 10/619,828 Page 3

Art Unit: 2814

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doyle.

Regarding claim 4, Doyle substantially discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for expressly disclosing the relative distances of the impurity region from the surface of the semiconductor region, and the source/drain regions from the surface. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make modifications regarding the proximate distance of the impurity region from the top surface of the semiconductor region, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Regarding claim 5, Doyle substantially discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for expressly disclosing silicon dioxide being used in the gate dielectric. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use silicon dioxide in the gate dielectric, since it is well known that silicon dioxide is extensively used in the gate dielectric portions of the MOS transistors.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doyle in view of Shaw et al., hereinafter Shaw (US Patent 4,069,094), previously cited.

Doyle discloses the limitations in the claims, as discussed above, but does not disclose the semiconductor region is monocrystalline silicon.

Shaw teaches monocrystalline silicon has advantages over polycrystalline silicon since it is more uniformed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use monocrystalline silicon in the structure of the Doyle reference to take advantage of the properties of the material such as uniformity and lower resistivity.

6. Claims 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doyle as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sagarwala et al., hereinafter Sagarwala (US Patent 6,759,717), previously cited.

Regarding claim 8, Doyle discloses the limitations in the claims, as discussed above, but does not disclose sidewall spacers for the gate of the device and lightly doped portion in the source and the drain of the device.

Sagarwala discloses in figure 11, sidewall spacers 50 and 38; and lightly doped portions 56 of the source and drain shown in the figure. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the structure of the Sagarwala reference, commonly known as a LDD structure, to benefit from the advantages of these kind of structures, such as reduced peak electric field at the edges of the source and drain regions (see Sagarwala, column 1, lines 44-47).

Regarding claims 9-12, Sagarwala discloses second source/drains and a second gate; 44' and 20 respectively, in figure 11. (note that the second transistor could be a n channel transistor, in which case the transistor on the right would be a p type transistor, as the conductivity types could be flipped).

Art Unit: 2814

## Response to Arguments

7. Applicants' arguments filed on 8/31/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the voids, or the impurity layers in the Doyle reference abuts the source and drain regions therein, and therefore the requirement of the limitation in claim 1, namely, the impurity region laterally spaced from the source and drain regions is not met.

Although, in some embodiments of the invention of the reference this might be true (for example figure 18), in embodiments such as figure 17 this is not the case, that is the impurity region 142 is spaced apart laterally from the source and drain region (see also paragraphs 47 and 48).

### Conclusion

8. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2814

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dana Farahani whose telephone number is (571)272-1706. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM - 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael M Fahmy can be reached on (571)272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

D. Farahani

LONG PHAM
PHINARY EXCELLINE